Exchange since , and senior partner in the stock-jobbing
firm of---.

and the one and a half columns of a Lord Stamfordham, the three columns of a Sir Edward Clarke, K,C., the one column of a Lord Trent, founder of Boot's Cash Chemist, the two columns allotted to Arnold Bennett, author, and to Sir Hugh Bell, iron-master.

ii

Lenin resolved all politics into the single question, Who whom?[3] Like two wrestlers locked together, each struggling to pin the other down and be uppermost, or standing apart and looking for a likely grip, or attempting some ruse, are 'Who' and 'Whom'. Their conflict is ceaseless, is history. When 'Who' is overthrown, becoming 'Whom', some who were 'Whom' become 'Who', and there are still 'Who' and 'Whom', wrestling; still the everlasting question to be answered—Who whom ?

'Who' has the advantage over 'Whom' of being established in authority; 'Whom' of numbers, and the energy derived from envy and a consciousness of wrongs endured. The resources of the State are at 'Who's' disposal—institutions civil and religious, wealth, honours, morality, law; 'Whom', uncorrupted by the exercise of power, may count on enthusiasm and dis-interestedness, on the dynamic resentment of all (and that is many) who feel they have had less than their deserts. 'Who* carries on from day to day, seizing opportunities to buttress up challenged authority as they present themselves, crushing or buying off opposition according to the exigencies of

the moment,
jolted and harassed, now seemingly almost pulled down by
'WhomV eager arms, now, a little breathless, recovering and
continuing to jog along, though shaken. 'Who' fluctuates, but
to 'Whom' there is no end—changeless, eternal, necessary
'Whom', 'Who's* prey and 'Who's' doom.

[3] This is a sounder classification than into 'haves' and 'have-nots', since there arc many 'haves' with 'have-not* characteristics, and vice versa,